

SUMMARIES

The Cases of Tennō's Death and Jōkō's Death —Shirakawa Jōkō—

NISHIGUCHI, Junko

Concerning the deaths and funerals of Jōkō (a retired emperor), I studied the example of Shirakawa Jōkō, deceased on 7th July 1129 (Taichi 4), comparing it with the example of Emperor Horikawa. It was customary to perform a funeral of an enthroned emperor in a form of abdication, irrespective of whether the emperor had abdicated or not in practice. The form of *Ryōan* 諒闇 (mourning), *Sofuku* 素服 and *iro* 倚廬 were determined separately depending on each case. In the case of Shirakawa Jōkō, his grandson Toba Jōkō insisted on holding the funeral in the style of *Fushi no Rei* (父子の礼、lit. the manner between a father and a son). This was not allowed, however, and the funeral was performed in the style of *Ryōan*, without wearing mourning dress and putting the purple-edged tatami mats in the Kitawataridono at the west of Shin-den (寝殿) for *iro*.

Shirakawa Jōkō defined a king (emperor) as a messenger of Shakamuni Buddha, saying 'Emperors are attached to Nyorai (a tathāgata)'. Shirakawa Jōkō as a Hō'ō ('cloistered' sovereign) regularly performed benevolent deeds such as constructions of Hosshōji and Shirakawa Shindō, copying a sutra *Is-saikyō*, issuing the Buddhist precept forbidding destruction of animal life, effecting Buddhist services, and so on. However, Shirakawa Jōkō, hypothetically a Hō'ō also after his death, was not able to achieve *Jōdo Ōjō* 浄土往生 (Birth in the Pure Land), instead wandering in *Chū'u* 中有 (the state between death and a new life). It was rumoured that the reason for this was that Shirakawa Jōkō's good deeds in life were equal in quantity to his evil karma. Moreover, the question whether Shirakawa Jōkō would achieve *Ōjō* or not was inquired at an early stage after his death, and 500 priests were chanting *Kindei-issaikyō* for him, also

performing a memorial service for Shaka Nyorai and Taishakuten. Buddhism, which was supposed to secure the health of Tennō and Jōkō, as well as to ensure their life after death, did allow for the discussion of emperor's *Ōjō* or evil karma. It was written in “Zoku Honchō Ōjō-den” (続本朝往生伝) that Emperor Ichijō and Gosanjō achieved *Ōjō*, however their deaths took place after their abdications and they were recognized as *Ōjō-sha* due to people's dreams. Ōe Masafusa (大江匡房), the editor of this anthology, has written that both emperors had fewer sins as they had accomplished *Jūzen no Gō* 十善の業 (the ten good acts). This showed that this *Jūzen no Gō* was used as a ruler against which emperor's sins were measured. The Emperor Horikawa passed away during his reign and was immediately succeeded by a new emperor. Only after this were the last emperor's sins inquired or his *Ōjō* discussed. There were no *Rinjū-gyōgi* 臨終行儀 (rites for his *Ōjō* performed by his deathbed) nor *Ōjō-Kizui* 往生奇瑞 (an auspicious sign) after his death. Prayer by the emperor's high priests at the dying emperor's bedside was only for his recovery from illness, not 後生 Gose, his afterlife. When a new emperor ascended to the throne and the late emperor became *in* 院 (an ex-emperor), the latter was entitled to have prayers and various Buddhist services performed for his Gose. After his death, his sins were inquired and his ‘birth in the Pure Land’ was recognized through people's dreams. In the case of the Emperor Daigo, who was said to have descended into hell, it was acknowledged that he fell only after his death, which occurred after his retirement. Thus, strictly speaking, a *Tennō's Ōjō* was not possible no matter how many good deeds an emperor had accomplished. In short, an emperor died as an *ordinary person*, without the title of being a descendant of gods when he left this world. I concluded that this fact showed the emperor at this time was not an enigmatic entity protected by gods and priests any longer.

Rōben and “Shoku Nihongi”

MAKI, Nobuyuki

Rōben, a priest of Tōdaiji, was one of the leading priests in the Nara period, and his necrology was inscribed in the “Shoku Nihongi”. However, his name appeared in only four places, including his necrology that excluded his biography. As this could show how the government appraised Rōben at the time of compilation of “Shoku Nihongi”, I clarified the relating matters examining the circumstances of the article and details.

I examined the notices pertaining to four priests among the six whose biographical descriptions appeared in “Shoku Nihongi”, excluding two priests called Genbō and Dōkyō whose biographies were included for other reasons. As a result of my considerations I concluded that the historical documents that were used for compiling the “Shoku Nihongi” were statements made by the temples to claim their economical privileges. Then examining the relationship between Rōben and Tōdaiji, I could assume that Rōben was not mentioned in Tōdaiji’s historical documents because this temple put an emphasis on its relationships to Emperor Shōmu and the Imperial Family when claiming its economical privileges. However, this did not mean that Rōben’s position within the temple was low, but simply showed that Tōdaiji, rebelling against governmental restrictions placed upon it, chose to emphasize its relationship to the Emperor. Moreover, there was a possibility that Rōben’s biography had not been completed when “Shoku Nihongi” was being compiled.

Considering the fact that articles about priests’ death were scarcely found in the “Shoku Nihongi”, Rōben’s necrology inscribed in it proved that his estimation by the government was by no means low.

The Lectures of “Kegon-gyō” at Tōdaiji
— Its Textbooks and Kyōsho —

MIYAZAKI, Kenji

The lectures of “Kegon-gyō” at Tōdaiji seemed to play an important role in forming the ideological base for building Rushana Daibutsu 盧舍那大仏 at Tōdaiji. According to ‘Tōdaiji Kegon Bekku Engi’ 東大寺華嚴別供縁起, these lectures started in Tempyō 12 (740 A.D.) when Rōben invited Shinjō 審祥 (Sim-sang) of Daianji 大安寺 to Konshusanji 金鐘山寺. The lectures continued up to Tempyō-Shōhō 3 (751) as four separate terms. Textbooks used are said to have been the sixty-fascicle Kegon Sutra “Daihōkōbutsu Kegon-gyō” 『大方広仏華嚴經』 translated by Budda Baddara 仏陀跋陀羅 (Buddhabhadra), and Hōzō’s 法蔵 “Hokekyō Tangeiki” 『法華經探玄記』 was used as reference. Also, eighty-fascicle Kegon Sutra “Daihōkōbutsu Kegon-gyō” translated by Jisshananda 実叉難陀 (Shikshananda) and “Zoku Kegon Ryakusho Kanjōki” 『続華嚴略疏刊定記』 by Keien 恵苑 were said to be used later.

Observing the progress of copying the “Kegon-gyō” and Kyōsho in the Tempyō era, both the “Sixty Kegon” 『六十華嚴』 and “Eighty Kegon” 『八十華嚴』 had already been brought to Japan at that time. The “Sixty Kegon” was used as a textbook first, which leads to the assumption that “Eighty Kegon” was not regarded as an important textbook. However, after Tempyō 20 (748), “Eighty Kegon” and its reference “Kanjōki” came to be frequently duplicated. “Kanjōki” appears to have been a rare book and it is thought to have been brought into Japan around this time. The importing of this “Kanjōki” aroused people’s interest in the “Eighty Kegon” and expedited its understanding, thus accelerating the change from “Sixty Kegon” to “Eighty Kegon” as the textbook for “Kegon-gyō”.

This change also applied to the lectures of “Kegon-gyō”. Three rolls of “Kanjōki” and two rolls of “Tangeiki” being copied from Tempyō 20 (748) to the next year, and when five rolls were duplicated and then sent to three priests called Gonchi 嚴智, Hyokei 標瓊 and Shotai 性泰. These three priests were the lecturers of “Kegon-gyō” in the third term (745–748) of the lectures. It is clear

that these duplicates were used for the lectures of “Kegon-gyō” at Tōdaiji. In short, “Kanjōki” was actually used as a reference for the lectures in 748, differing slightly from the account given in ‘Tōdaiji Kegon Bekku Engi’.

Building of the Rushana Daibutsu was rapidly accelerated after its location was moved from Shigaraki to Heijō, the construction of Tōdaiji was greatly advanced, and needless to say “Kanjōki” was imported, no doubt due to the lectures of “Kegon-gyō” exerting much influence on forming an ideological base. Under these conditions the “Eighty Kegon” and “Kanjōki” were used as the preferred textbooks for the lectures at Tōdaiji.

The Regulations and Organization of Zen in Medieval Ages

HARADA, Masatoshi

In this paper, I examined the reality of Ji’ in-hō 寺院法 (the law of temples), which existed along with the Kuge-hō 公家法 (the law for court nobles) and Bakufu-hō 幕府法 (the law of the Shogunate), giving particular attention to the regulations of Zen temples. In China the laws for Zen temples were enacted as Seiki 清規 (literally ‘pure regulations’), however, in this paper I have collected the original documents pertaining to these laws in Japan. I emphasized clarification of the whole image, hoping for this groundwork to be used as the basic data for comparing regulations of other sects of Buddhist temples.

There were three divisions among Medieval Zen: the Five Great Temples 五山官寺系 such as Nanzenji, Kenchōji, etc.; the Rinzai school 臨濟系 林下寺院 such as Daitokuji, Myōshinji and Buttsūji, etc.; and the Sōtō school 曹洞宗系 寺院 such as Eiheiji, Sōjiji, etc.

For the Five Great Temples, under protection of the Kamakura Shogunate and the Muromachi Shogunate, the law was fixed in consultation with Zen priests as a part of the law of the Shogunate. In the individual temples, the laws known as Kai-hō were written, among other places, on temple walls, Kabegaki 壁書. Administrative positions, including that of the head priest who would usu-

ally hold the seat in one temple until the end of his life, were made transferable. In order to choose competent people, transfers were required after only a short term in the office. This system was called Kugai 公界. The term Kugai was later expanded to mean 'a space not privately occupied', 'outside world' or 'public use' when the word came to be widely used outside of temples. This term is very important when we think about the idea of what 'public (公)' means in Japanese society.

It is thought that the head priest of Daitokuji and others were succeeding the position on arbitrary basis since Kaisan Ippa Sōshō 開山一派相承. In fact, three candidates were chosen and the head priest was decided by a lottery held in front of Kaisan no Tō 開山の塔 (the pagoda of the founder of a temple).

All administrative positions were transferable. In many of the local temples, including the subsidiary temples, personnel transition was strictly implemented. Minor temples (tatchū 塔頭) within a greater temple were also under the same type of regulation, moreover, there was an active interchange of personnel between local subsidiary temples. As for the Sōtō school, Keizanjōkin 瑩山韶瑾 sect had developed rapidly because the head priest was chosen by turns. The sect established base temples where the promotions were assured, and with the help from the government each temple was accorded a rank, eventually forming a hierarchy which was a different one from the Great Five Temples.

The idea of the Zen regulations is epitomized in the term 'kugai'. Although this regulation of transfers was originally maintained by the Buddhist law, the guarantee of having worldly power became more important for the person who held the Kugai position due to autonomy among priests and authority of the founder of the temple, the Shogunate, the Imperial court and the local authorities became very influential for maintaining the regulation. Therefore, instead of the expansion of power of the temples, inclination to power struggle was converged in the authorities.

The Faith in Nembutsu (念仏) of Satodairi (里内裏) and
Court Aristocracy (公家衆) in the Late Fifteenth Century

NISHIDA, Enga

First I examined “Sakkaiki 薩戒記” (photographed version) according to the description by Nakayama Sadachika. Although the articles I examined for this paper were only the descriptions during 14 days from 16th to 29th of February, 1425 (Oei 32), I found that historical incidents worthy of note occurred during this period. One of these was an incident where Ogawa-no-Miya, only 22 years old and the second prince of Emperor Gokomatsu, passed away unexpectedly. Another was the death of Ashikaga Yoshikazu, 19 years old and the Fifth Shogun, who had been sworn into the position of Shogun only two years before. This second incident occurred only 12 days after the misfortune in the Imperial Family.

In the funeral ceremonies of the former, performed in the manner of Shingon-Risshū sect, as well as the latter in manner of the Zen sect, Faith of Nembutsu (recitation of Amida's name), particularly the style of rites performed at one's death, was observed to have been emphasized. I commented upon some points in a Buddhist service for an intermediate state between death and the next life (Chūin-Hōyō 中陰法要), on the anniversary of the death (Nenkai-Hōyō 年回法要), and the Gakki Meinichi 月忌命日 also known as Go-Sai Mairi 御齋参り.

In the next chapter, I attempted to consider the point of ‘Okurodo お黒戸’, the hall housing the image of a Buddha for the imperial court and also ‘Okurodo no Nembutsu お黒戸の念仏’ performed there.

This faith of Nembutsu was created by the Imperial Family when the air of crisis grew during the Ōnin War and the Bunmei War. In ‘Kanken 管見’, Hyakumanben Nembutsu 百万遍念仏 begun to be held as an established custom after 1472, Emperor Gotsuchimikado's reign. This Buddhist service was quite a private one as only relatives and followers of the Imperial Family participated, including inner and outer groups who did night duty for the court. It was not a

service of Hyakumanben Juzukuri 百万遍数珠くり which is still very popular in many places nowadays, but a service of Shuryō Nembutsu 数量念仏 which was dependent upon the participants' will. This service was performed continuously during the reigns of Emperors Gotsuchimikado, Gokashwabara, Gonara and Shōgimachi. I examined the transformation of this service as time passed.

Finally I added some new view points: one is a historical reference 'Ryōbosei 両墓制', showing a primitive form as it is known in folklore. Another is the action that the dying person was brought into the hall of a family temple and had the deathbed rituals performed there. I also referred to the comment, "There is no filth when one dies" pointed out by Seiji Nishigaki and Itaru Chijiwa. I would like to consider this comment deeper as my future subject.

A Feudal Lord's Foreign Policy and Zen Temples in the Medieval Age : On Diplomatic Affairs

KAI, Hideyuki

This paper is intended as an investigation of foreign affairs in the late medieval time, and how Zen monks of Gozan temples (五山僧), particularly Tōfukuji, came to be involved in this matter.

There have been prolific researches about foreign affairs in the late medieval time even before the Second World War. They showed that foreign affairs at this time were conducted not only by the Shogunate but also by feudal lords in local areas.

Zen monks of Gozan temples took the roles of a head or sub-head of delegations and those of advisors, by selecting members of delegations, researching the previous attempts and preparing diplomatic documents including electing writers for these papers. Diplomatic documents were called *sho* 疏 and had to be rewrit-

ten each time when a delegation was to be dispatched, stating the reasons for their mission and listing desired objects of trade. Formulating such documents required detailed knowledge and skillful penmanship. The writers of those documents, such as Zuikeishūhō 瑞溪周鳳, must have possessed exceptional linguistic abilities even among renowned Gozan priests.

Would it be possible to further our understanding of feudal lords' foreign policy on diplomatic affairs? Although there was research referring to Zen monks who had been sent as delegates of feudal lords, those documents mainly emphasized the clarification of facts of negotiation, yet the matter of pre-negotiation such as making documents has not been thoroughly examined so far.

In this paper I considered the points mentioned above and examined the foreign affairs conducted by Lord Ōuchi 大内氏, who monopolized the Japan-Ming affairs 日明交渉. The domination in the Japan-Ming affairs by Lord Ōuchi means that he must have managed all transactions related to sending delegations by himself. But even Lord Ōuchi, who sent a private delegation to Korea, could not manage all of the affairs, and had to rely on a group who had this kind of knowledge. Meanwhile, Tōfukuji, one of the Gozan temples but not involved with foreign affairs, owned some land within the Ōuchi family's domain. After the temple's head priest Ryōankeigo 了庵桂悟 had gone down to Suō 周防 (Yamaguchi prefecture), Tōfukuji succeeded in approaching Lord Ōuchi. Finally the temple took on the important role of executing foreign affairs for Ōuchi family.

Military Governors of Kawachi Province in Sengoku Period and

Ikkō Ikki

KOTANI, Toshiaki

In order to investigate some characteristics of power structure in Kinki area in Sengoku period I analyzed mainly Kawachi province. The significance of examining one clan as a measure was in order to scrutinize the former recognition of Kinki area in Sengoku period. That is to say, the theory of seeing Kinki area as a whole domain ruled by Hosokawa Kyōchō family made the discussion of

the characteristics of each county in Kinki area difficult, as well as hindering deeper research into the relationship between the power of Daimyō (lord) and that of Ikkō Ikki (Ikkō Uprising).

Here, I presented two different types of Ryōshu existent in the power structures used by Hatakeyama, a military governor in Sengoku period, and discussed the changes taking place within them from the beginning to the middle of 16th century. One type was a bureaucratic type of lord (*kanryō-gata sengoku ryōshu*), a magistrate possessing the privilege to issue *Hanbutsu* and sharing a part of the military lord's power. Another type was a locally powerful lord (*chi'ikkenryoku-gata sengoku ryōshu*), supported by warriors, having a strong military power of his own.

The foundation of power in 16th century was related to the birth of a new region. Previously, the domination of regions by military lords was considered to exist at county-level, but with the expansion of regions, the area had become much larger than a county. Regional codes (*kokuhō*) were promulgated in those wide areas and a group of them was united into two parts called *Jōgun* (upper county) and *Gegun* (lower county). *Chi'ikkenryoku-gata sengoku ryōshu* gained military power in these areas.

Meanwhile, development of the influence of Ikkō Ikki had some connection to those new areas. Villages related to Honganji were formed on a river bank naturally made by Yodo and Yamato rivers, and this bank was maintained by the integration of *Shugo* (military lord), *Kokujin* (local lords) and Ikkō sectarians. A military lord was deeply involved in maintenance of this bank in the 16th century.

The Tenbun Ikkō Ikki that took place in the middle of 16th century was a serious battle between military lords and Ikkō sectarians. The peace negotiations phased into two stages. First was the negotiation between each *Shugo* and *Ryōshu* and second was *Shugo* and *Ryōshu* together negotiating with the peasants. As a result the power of *Shugo* overcame the power of all *Ryōshu* as the former guaranteed *Buji*, Safety. *Kokuhō*, regional codes at this time existed basically in order to protect peasants and to prevent private conflicts, and corresponded to *Buji* provided by *Shugo*. *Jinaimachi* in Kawachi Province was

founded on the grounds of *Buji* by *Shugo* and was in practice supported by *Chi'ikikenryoku-gata Sengoku Ryōshu*.

Ōsakanami established in the Eiroku era (1558–1569) as a movement of obtaining the privilege of *Jinai* is considered to have developed since Honganji had become *Monseki* and the *Jinaimachi* were officially authorized.

Notes on the Yagi Family Archives in Bizen Province

MIZUNO, Kyoichiro

The Yagi family has been performing the role of a Shintō priest for Kyōseki Shrine on the Yagi mountain in Bizen city, Okayama Prefecture. The founder of the Yagi family, Saemon Tarō Jōkei, resident of Yagi village during the Keichō period (1596-1614), was a sculptor of Buddhist images. He was singled out by Ikeda Terumasa (the lord of the Himeji Castle at the time), the founder of the Ikeda family and the lord of Bizen-Okayama Province. Ikeda Terumasa praised Jōkei's good conducts and presented him land as a special benefit. Jōkei was delighted and carved Terumasa's image on a stone after his death and deified the statue in his family. I examined the circumstances during this period.

Next point is about Ikeda Mitsumasa, the grandson of Terumasa, who was a lord at the beginning of Edo period. He renovated the Kyōseki Shrine and there deified his grandfather, Terumasa, as the shrine god and the stone statue carved by Jōkei as the sacred object. He also gave the family name 'Yagi' and the position of Shintō priest of this Kyōseki Shrine to descendants of Jōkei. I examined these historical proceedings using some of the Yagi family archives and added my perspective in this paper.

Aspects of Village Temples
—Religion and Politics in Villages in Premodern Ages—

IMAHORI, Taitso

Gokanoshō-chō, Kanzaki-gun, Shiga prefecture is situated at the center of the Kotō plains on the west bank area of the River Echi. When the chronicle of the town was being compiled recently I was in charge of the section entitled 'Development of religion in Medieval ages'. In this paper, I discussed some aspects of village temples appearing in documents of the village history in four chapters: I 'Family temples converting to a different Buddhist sect and parishioners'; II 'Zen temples and old Buddha images'; III 'Priests resident in Kondō village and a guarantee contract by the head priest'; IV 'Regular annual events of Obata village'. I pointed out the fact that people accepted Buddhism subjectively in this area. My conclusion is presented below.

Most of the village temples which held villagers' funerals were established after the Sengoku period, with the exception of a few Dōjō (places for worshipping Buddha and spiritual practices) belonging to the Ikkō sect. Those village temples were said to have originated from Tendai sect temples and after some obsolescent time villagers revived the temples (中興 Chūkō). Although the term 'Chūkō' was used, the actual temple buildings had burnt down during the Sengoku period. The villagers were simply succeeding the land where Tendai temples used to stand and were either maintaining only '寺号 Jigō' or worshipping the Buddha image from ex-temples as '本尊 Honzon', the main revered figure. In fact temples were newly erected by the village or Danka (families of lay believers).

Nembutsu sect temples maintained an image of Amida as their 'Honzon'. Particularly Ikkō sect had 'Honzon' provided by the head temple and strictly prohibited the villagers to worship or admire other Buddha images as well as Shinto gods. It meant that villagers could not put a Buddha image which they had been worshipping before in the main temple as 'Kyakubutsu' (a guest statue of Buddha). They were also not allowed to organize '講 kō' (religious or frater-

nal associations) in order to build and maintain a Buddha-hall in the temple precincts. Zen sect temples allowed villagers to worship Yakushi Nyorai or Kan'on Bosatsu which the villagers worshipped from olden times as the 'Honzon'. Villagers gradually invited Zen priests to the village temples to hold funerals and memorial services for their ancestors. Eventually the temples were converted to Zen sect. In the background of the fact that many village temples belonged to the Zen sect was the factor of continuation of the villager's own faith.

It was clear that the difference of '宗旨 Shūshi' (tenet of a sect) of family temples have exerted a considerable influence on life and religion in the villages. In order not to cause conflicts among villagers or to keep the village from prospering, the village government officials kept strict watch on the chief priests and were cautious about the influence of the main temple in managing village temples. The family temples were incorporated into the events of the villages and many 'kō' such as Kan'on-kō, Jizō-kō, and Gyōja-kō were organized to involve the family temples and encourage the exchange between the villagers and members of family temples.

Village temples existed not only for holding funerals and memorial services for ancestors but also, under the administration of the village, were connected deeply to the faith and village autonomy system which was beyond the frame of sectorial Buddhism. Priests of the village were in fact employed for praying and servicing the 'Honzon' and performing funerals. It was the villages and the villagers that had full responsibility for managing and organizing religious amenities in villages.

Politics and Religion in Modern Japan

—New Buddhist Movement—

AKAMATSU, Tesshin

'Bukkyō Seito Dōshikai 仏教清徒同志会' was inaugurated in February, 1899 (Meiji 32) in order to part with the existing Buddhist orders which have been propelling the movement of Kōninkyō 公認教運動. This organization depended on the state for protection. It insisted on normalization of relations between poli-

tics and religion, criticizing some Buddhist orders which took the stance of exclusivism against Christianity, the use of religion for governmental purposes and governmental interference in religious matters.

However, this organization's fundamental posture went no further than the 'Constitution of the Empire of Japan (1889)'. Its idea of freedom of religion was based on the Article 28 in Chapter II 'Rights and Duties of Subject' : Japanese subjects shall, within limits not prejudicial to peace and order, and not antagonistic to their duties as subjects, enjoy freedom of religious belief. The philosophy of this organization was based on the principle of "Protection for and interference in religion should be expelled"; yet, its demand for *freedom of religion* did not necessarily mean the demand for human rights ensuring human dignity. The 1912 (Meiji 45) *anti-Sankyōkaidō movement* 「三教会同」 反対運動 exhorted the policy of *freedom of religion*, but 'Bukkyō Seito Dōshikai' accepted the theory that Shinto was not counted as religion, in the same manner as other Bukkyō organizations, without criticizing the system of State Shintō. As was observed in *the issue of propagation of the Buddhist faith in inland China* 支那内地布教権問題, the reformative stance held by this movement at its conception had disappeared, and they now positively approved of the division of the colonized land in China by the Japanese Empire. Moreover, when the Japanese government tried to delete the Fifth of the Twenty-one Requests as to 'negotiate at a later date' thus practically trying to eradicate the matter, a member of the New Buddhist Movement made great efforts to acquire the right for propagation of the faith in China, and censured the weak-kneed diplomacy of the government. The transfiguration of New Buddhists who took an active part in imperialist foreign policy was revealed. The New Buddhist Movement lost its meaning and finally its identity in the changing situation; and this movement ceased activities in August 1915 (Taishō 4).

As described above, this New Buddhist Movement began and ended with a focus on mundane affairs. Its ideology, *reform of New Buddhism* had vanished in the changing circumstances, and its *raison d'être* finally disintegrated as the imperialist movement became firmly established. Consequently it was clear that the movement itself lacked a *universal ideology* and the ability to grasp the situ-

ation objectively, despite their declaration that the movement was based on *New Religion* and *New Faith*.

The New Buddhist Movement raised questions about the problems between politics and religion, particularly Buddhism, in modern Japan, which have yet to be answered with regard to historical and Buddhist ideological ideas.

Religion and Politics
Toward a Redefinition of their Boundaries
—The case of Europe—

BELLINI, Lino

During the recent history of Europe, many factors (such as the appearance on the world stage of many fundamentalist movements, the tendency of the late communist countries to identify religion with nation, the diffusion of Islam, the renewed public role of the traditional churches, etc.) indicate that religion has emerged from the irrelevance to which it had been confined in the past decades. At the same time, such a recovery of the importance of religion seems to be often accompanied by an increase of conflictuality, to the point that many people, to avoid a recurrence of intolerance, are looking for new models of relationship between religion and politics, public religious organizations and the state.

Traditionally, modern European models can be divided into models regulated by Concordats (catholic countries), separatist models (secular countries), and models regulated by peculiar forms of State religions (Protestant countries). In spite of their differences, such models rest on a common juridical ground: they share a common notion of the impartiality of the state, determine the area of activity of the various religious subjects and recognize the right of the state to be the guarantor of the rules of the game.

In the present paper I try to describe how, today, such models and their historical realizations have reached a crisis not only because of the changed situation and the social factors mentioned above, but also because of a more radical criticism coming from the European (Christian) churches toward the a-morality

of the modern conception of the state and its inner deficiencies. In a more positive way, this paper tries to re-define the position of religion in European society, and to delineate some of the main characteristics of the new model : a model which - in full respect of the distinction between religion and State - could also be respectful and tolerant of religious pluralism, enriched by interreligious dialogue and ecumenism, sensitive to the necessities of solidarity and justice, and rooted in a metaphysical and inculturated conception of human rights.